

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker I wish to express my great pleasure at the unanimous approval by the House yesterday of the Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965. I was on the floor of the House earlier in the afternoon and was in my office for the remainder of the day. I heard the first bells for a record vote on H.R. 2986, but the second bells did not ring in my part of the Old House Office Building and hence I missed the rollcall vote. I have reported this fact to those in charge of the bell signals, but I also want to record my strong approval and support for this legislation.

I was one of those who introduced legislation to create these community health centers, and it is this legislation enacted in 1963 which H.R. 2986 will extend and amend. Coming as I do from a district and a State with a substantial number of senior citizens and a burgeoning population, I am keenly aware of the need for Federal assistance to the total community in establishing facilities for meeting the health needs and especially the mental health needs of our people.

I voted for the extension of this program in the Rules Committee and strongly support it, and had I not by inadvertence been prevented from being on the floor I would have voted for H.R. 2986 with pride and personal satisfaction.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK CONFERENCE IN PARAGUAY

(Mr. HALPERN asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was given leave of absence last week, having been assigned to serve as an official delegate to the Inter-American Development Bank Conference, in Paraguay.

During this period, certain issues were acted upon by the House, and I would like at this time to state the positions I would have taken, had I been present to vote on them.

I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 86, in favor of authorizing appropriations for the National Council on the Arts on an annual basis. I have long advocated such a Council and feel this legislation is most helpful to implement its admirable objectives.

I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 85, in support of Mr. Kroch's motion that the House recede from its disagreement with the Senate's addition of \$942,000 for subsidies for helicopter services in New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago.

I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 82, for passage of the Water Quality Act of 1965. This, too, is extremely desirable legislation and is a long step forward in the fight on water pollution.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 78, and "yea" on rollcall No. 79, against recommital, and for passage of H.R. 6497, the bill to increase the U.S. contribution to the International Monetary Fund. As a

member of the International Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I attended the hearings on this bill, and strongly supported its enactment. The bill increases our quota to the International Monetary Fund by 25 percent, to a total of \$5,160 million. This increase will give the United States additional funds upon which to draw to alleviate our current short-run balance-of-payments deficit. This bill strengthens the International Monetary Fund, and thereby enhances the stability of exchange markets, and promotes international trade.

PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, I am sure, will give immediate approval to the President's request for additional funds to cover Defense Department needs, despite the fact that President Johnson was inconsistent and disappointing in his public address to the assembled Members of Congress this morning.

It was most disappointing for me to hear the President discuss the crises in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic without stating that our policy is to completely remove the Communist menace to both of these countries. The President was laboriously carrying water on both shoulders in that he was asking Congress for additional military funds while literally begging the Communists to enter into negotiations.

It is inconsistent for us to have made the necessary and dramatic move in the Dominican Republic without logically developing a policy of completely eliminating Communist subversive activities in that country and reconstituting a program which would produce a legitimate government in Cuba, since the Castro government is directly involved in the Dominican revolt and in Red guerrilla activities in other Latin American lands.

Negotiations in Vietnam will be fruitless if they permit continued Communist subversion in Laos and Cambodia and leave North Vietnam as an un molested Red bastion. If we are to follow our obligation to preserve peace with freedom for our allies in southeast Asia, enforcement of a policy which would prevent North Vietnam from supporting aggression is necessary.

The President is obviously weakening in the face of growing Communist pressure and the shrill cries of appeasement coming from many of his party's leading congressional figures. Therefore, it is necessary for the public and the Republican Members of Congress to reinvigorate the President's determination to maintain a strong stand in defense of our present commitments and to logically carry out a policy of thwarting all Communist activities in the Western Hemisphere. Furthermore, we must stop the Reds cold in southeast Asia and we cannot equivocate on that point.

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT JAMES M. NABRIT, JR., OF HOWARD UNIVERSITY CONCERNING ORGANIZATION KNOWN AS STUDENTS FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM

(Mr. MATTHEWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I enclose for the record very interesting articles which appeared in the Washington Post on April 28, and in the U.S. News & World Report of May 10, and which quoted President James M. Nabrit, Jr., of Howard University, concerning an organization known as Students for Academic Freedom.

I want to congratulate President Nabrit for his forthright statement, and say that activities of this group have been called to my attention by other officials in other universities. I hope more university officials will express their opinions concerning this organization, because, as President Nabrit stated:

They must be unmasked for the frauds they are. They must be fought in every arena, and they must not be permitted to prevail.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 28, 1965]
HOWARD UNIVERSITY UNREST BLAMED ON OUTSIDE FORCES

(By Stephen C. Rogers)

President James M. Nabrit, Jr., of Howard University yesterday blamed recent unrest at Howard on a few students he believes may be influenced by "external disruptive forces."

"They are people who cloak themselves in the mantle of civil rights and plot and plan in secret to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship," Nabrit said in a statement approved by the university's board of trustees.

"They must be unmasked for the frauds they are. They must be fought in every arena, and they must not be permitted to prevail."

At a press conference yesterday, Nabrit said he was referring to the Students for Academic Freedom.

The group sponsored a demonstration at Howard last Friday to protest compulsory ROTC, class attendance rules and the University's action in changing the status of a philosophy professor. About 200 students gathered for the demonstration.

Nabrit said the demonstration violated no university rule, and the school has taken no steps to discipline its leaders.

"But," he warned, "I will not sit idly by and see the University become a place of lawlessness and disorder."

He added that on one occasion he saw two known Communists on a Student for Academic Freedom picket line.

Nabrit also expressed concern over "increasing evidence of a lack of respect for duly constituted authority" both at Howard and outside it.

Of protest demonstrations generally, he said "they are not the only answer. They are reaching a point of diminishing returns. We must adhere to a rule of law."

He also defended the Howard student body against apathy charges and said the university places "no restriction" on the right of students to demonstrate as individuals. Howard has not disciplined students arrested in demonstrations, he said.

May 4, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, HOUSE
Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500120034-7 9085

[From the U.S. News & World Report, May 10, 1965]

MORE CAMPUS UNREST—Are Reds to Blame?

WASHINGTON.—Campus unrest has now broken out at Howard University, the Nation's biggest predominantly Negro college.

As on other troubled campuses, outside agitation and Communist influence are being cited.

Said Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr., president of Howard: *Outsiders may be infiltrating rights groups "to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship."*

"OPEN DEFIANCE"

Howard has more than 9,000 students. Many leaders in national civil rights organizations have come from its student body and faculty. Now, says Dr. Nabrit, there are "growing signs of open defiance of law and order" on the campus.

A group called Students for Academic Freedom, which includes some faculty members, has demonstrated against alleged repressive rules and regulations, and had demanded abolition of compulsory military training at the school.

In a statement read to a freshman assembly, Dr. Nabrit said a campaign seemed to be afoot "to bring the university into general disrepute."

"I will not sit idly by and see the university become a place of lawlessness and disorder," he said.

"We must beware of some people who come to us like the Greeks bearing gifts. They do not believe in civil rights for anyone."

"They are children of lawlessness and disciples of destruction."

"They are people who cloak themselves in the robes of civil rights and plot and plan in secret to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship."

"They must be unmasked for the frauds they are. They must be fought in every arena, and they must not be permitted to prevail."

KEPS IN A PICKET LINE

Dr. Nabrit's statement was approved by the university's board of trustees. Discussing it in a later news conference, he said he had seen at least two Communists in a picket line outside the school. Excerpts of his remarks, as recorded by NBC-TV:

"I saw some Communists passing out throwaways. I saw some Communists helping deliver placards. . . . These are grown people, they're not students"

"They have never denied that they were Communists, and they have been the leaders in the Communist group in Washington all the years I've been here. We had to put them out of the NAACP."

Dr. Nabrit said that Howard may have been designated as the target for the kind of outside agitation that stirred outbreaks at the University of California's Berkeley campus.

"I don't see any relationship whatsoever to the civil rights movement at Berkeley or here," he said. "I don't see that it's got anything to do with the civil rights movement. At Howard, everybody from the president on down has been participating in civil rights."

COMMUNISM AND MARTIN LUTHER KING

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include an editorial.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the association of men and organizations with Communist leanings with the leaders of the civil rights movement is well known to those in authority, but these connections are very seldom made known to the people.

In an effort to circumvent the news blackout on this vital subject, I plan, from time to time, to make these associations known by publishing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where censorship cannot erase the facts from public view.

The first of these insertions concerns the Communist Party and Martin Luther King and appeared in the current issue of the National Review Bulletin, volume 17, No. 19.

Today's award for throwing the baby out with the bathwater goes to the U.S. Supreme Court for its 5-3 decision overturning Louisiana's Subversive Activities and Communist Control Act. The Court heard, and apparently agreed with, arguments that the Act had been used to "harm" civil rights activities. The case concerned the Southern Conference Education Fund, which assists civil rights groups, especially the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee ("Snick"). According to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, SCEP is the successor to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which was "conceived, financed, and set up by the Communist Party in 1938 as a mass organization to promote communism throughout the Southern States." When the SCHW became the SCEP in 1948, it retained its offices, telephone, publications (the Southern Patriot—also cited as subversive) and officers, all but one of whom have been identified under oath as Communists. Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, a militant leftist and close colleague of Martin Luther King, is now president of SCEP, but it is for the most part operated by Carl and Anna Braden, both of whom have been identified in sworn testimony as Communists. Mrs. Braden is editor of the Southern Patriot. On October 5, 1963, after an 11-month investigation, SCEP's offices in New Orleans were raided by local and State police who seized a truckload of its records and arrested three of its officers, acting on the authority of the Communist Control Act. The action before the Supreme Court evolved from SCEP's efforts to recover these records. In the meantime, the Louisiana State Committee on Un-American Activities, also authorized by the act, prepared an excellent two-volume report on SCEP's activities, extensively documenting Communist involvement in the civil rights movement.

HORTON BILL TO COMBAT ARAB BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in informing my colleagues that I have introduced a bill today making it the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to our Nation. The purpose of this legislation is to assist American exporters defy the intimidation of the Arabs and their demands in connection with Israel trade.

For over 13 years there has existed an agreement among the various Arab States to boycott Israel, Israel goods, and all companies engaged in business arrangements—direct or indirect—with Israel. To coordinate this malicious activity, the Arab countries created the Central Arab Boycott of Israel Office, located in Damascus, Syria.

This office wages a continual war of pressure on the great number of foreign

companies that do business in the Arab world in order to prevent their undertaking similar activities in Israel. The boycott office ferrets out the names of companies engaged in commerce with Israel to compile its blacklist, a roster of those forbidden to market products or services in the Arab countries.

The boycott office operates in such a way as to make it necessary that our American Government condemn it in the strongest possible fashion. It has demanded from independent American businessmen answers to a detailed questionnaire relating to their commercial practices. This information then is used to determine whether the company goes on the blacklist.

Many of our companies have refused to yield to this blackmail. As a result, they have been denied a market in the entire Arab world. While their refusal redounds to their everlasting credit, I think we can agree that they should not be made to suffer the kind of economic discrimination which results from the fact that others may have given in to the threats of the Arabs.

There is no reason why we should not establish in the clearest and most convincing terms that the United States opposes this kind of harassment of its business firms. We also must write a positive national policy of our opposition to any and all such trade practices which are designed to intimidate countries whose feelings are friendly to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of the bill I have offered. I urge Congress to move its enactment as promptly as possible.

AID'S OPERATION AS REPORTED BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, on three other occasions I have discussed the Agency for International Development's operation as reported to the Congress in studies issued by the Comptroller General.

Today I will mention a final report and, at the same time, earnestly request that the Congress direct the House Government Operations Committee to initiate an immediate investigation into all activities of AID and AID reports to the Congress.

I find this final report concerning AID most disturbing.

The Comptroller General charges the Agency for International Development with presenting misinformation and distorted reports to the Congress, and in turn to the public.

The Comptroller General's report entitled "Ineffective Utilization of Excess Personal Property Program in the Foreign Assistance Program" was issued on April 12, 1965.

The title alone should prompt careful attention on the part of the Congress because, in its 1965 budget presentation to Congress, AID reported savings of more than \$43 million in the area of excess personal property.

a sample of such an agreement required by a large corporation. (See enclosure.)

I hereby assign to the corporation my entire right, title, and interest in any invention or idea, patentable or not, hereafter made or conceived solely or jointly by me.

(a) While working in the corporation in an executive, managerial, planning, technical, research or engineering capacity (including development, manufacturing, systems, applied science, sales and customer engineering); and

(b) Which relates in any manner to the actual or anticipated business of the corporation or its subsidiaries, or relates to its actual or anticipated research and development, or is suggested by or results from any task assigned to me or work performed by me for or on behalf of the corporation.

I am a physician for this corporation and have a personal interest in patent policy, but I also believe that it goes far beyond me. There are thousands of scientifically and technically trained people who would bring their ideas to fruition if only they could be assured of reaping the fruits of the labor.

I cannot conceive of any man with a sense of justice not finding this patent agreement at variance with Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

EMPLOYEE CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION AND INVENTION AGREEMENT

(To be signed by all employees on the first day of employment)

In consideration of my employment by

1. I will not disclose to anyone outside of _____ or use in other than _____ business, any confidential information or material relating to the business of _____ or its subsidiaries, either during or after my _____ employment, except with _____ written permission.

2. I will not disclose to _____, or induce _____ to use, any confidential information or material belonging to others.

3. I will comply, and do all things necessary for _____ to comply, with U.S. Government regulations, and with provisions of contracts between the agencies of the U.S. Government or their contractors and _____, which relate either to patent rights or to the safeguarding of information pertaining to the defense of the United States.

4. I hereby assign to _____ my entire right, title and interest in any invention or idea, patentable or not, hereafter made or conceived solely or jointly by me:

(a) while working in _____ in an executive, managerial, planning, technical, research or engineering capacity (including development, manufacturing, systems, applied science, sales and customer engineering); and

(b) which relates in any manner to the actual or anticipated business of _____ or its subsidiaries, or relates to its actual or anticipated research and development, or is suggested by or results from any task assigned to me or work performed by me for or on behalf of _____, except any invention or idea which I cannot assign to _____ because of a prior invention agreement with _____ which is effective until _____. (Give name and date or write "none").

5. I agree that in connection with any invention or idea covered by paragraph 4:

(a) I will disclose it promptly to the local patent operations manager; and

(b) I will, on his request, promptly execute a specific assignment of title to _____, and do anything else reasonably necessary to enable _____ to secure a patent therefor in the United States and in foreign countries.

6. I represent that I have indicated on the back of this form whether or not I have any inventions or ideas, not covered by paragraph 4, in which I have any right, title, or interest, and which were previously conceived either wholly or in part by me, but

neither published nor filed in the U.S. Patent Office, and identified all of these.

(It is in your interest to establish that any such inventions or ideas were made before employment by _____. You should not disclose such inventions or ideas in detail, but only identify them by the titles and dates of documents describing them. If you wish to invent _____ in such inventions and ideas, you may submit them to _____ in accordance with the provisions contained in _____.)

7. I acknowledge receipt of a copy of this agreement, and agree that with respect to the subject matter hereof, it is my entire agreement with _____, superseding any previous oral or written communications, representations, understandings, or agreements with _____ or any official or representative thereof.

Witness: _____ (Employee's manager or other appropriate representative or _____ representative)

Signed: _____ (Employee's full name)

Date: _____

The following are inventions or ideas, not covered by paragraph 6, in which I have any right, title, or interest, and which were previously conceived either wholly or in part by me, but neither published nor filed in the U.S. Patent Office: (Indicate below or write "None").

Description of documents (if applicable):

Title on document.

Date on document.

Name of witness on document.

Signed: _____ (Employee's full name)

Date: _____

Witness: _____

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
KNOXVILLE, TENN., February 4, 1965.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
U. S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator LONG: When the enclosed letter came to me a few days ago, my thoughts went back to the day, nearly 2 years ago, when I appeared before your committee in the hearings on Government patent policy.

You will recall we discussed the fact that new processes developed by TVA in its fertilizer research are patented by TVA; that these patents are made available to the fertilizer industry on a royalty free, nonexclusive basis; and that, as a result of this policy, farmers are getting more and better chemical fertilizers and at lower prices than they did 10 or 12 years ago.

We also discussed the special importance of TVA's research and its patent policy to the smaller, economic, manufacturing, fertilizer. At the time of the hearing 170 of the 207 companies licensed to use TVA patents were in the category of small business, and I pointed out our belief that many of those small manufacturers would not have been able to stay in business without the benefits of TVA's research and the use of our patents.

The enclosed letter from the Ouachita Fertilizer & Grain Co. is such an illuminating testimonial to many of the points we discussed in your hearing that I feel sure you will be interested to see it. Incidentally, the polyphosphates referred to represent a promising family of fertilizers, new since our discussion, so I can assure you that our work in this field is continuing to show results.

Sincerely yours,

ASSENY J. WASSER,
Chairman.

OUACHITA FERTILIZER & GRAIN CO., INC.,
Mowee, La., January 25, 1965.

Mr. A. J. Wasser,
Chairman, Board of Directors, Tennessee

Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn.

Dear Mr. Wasser: The recent trend in the fertilizer industry continues, and it appears that small independent manufacturers such as our own firm will be at an even greater

disadvantage in the future. We are calling this to your attention in order to emphasize the importance of TVA's continuing its cooperation with these small independents and the farmers we serve.

In the present situation, a number of major companies will approach an independent to see if he wants to sell his business. If the independent prefers to remain as he is, the major companies seem less interested than before in supplying him, with fringe benefits included. Privately, they confirm that they are working toward captive distribution, and once they attain their objective, the unpredictable requirements of the independent will not be important to them. Those major companies who preferred to supply independents have been forced to abandon this position. So one of our concerns is supply. Phosphate is the material we worry about, polyphosphates in particular. Perhaps you are aware that when we first thought of using wet-process acid for our liquid mixtures, the only encouraging reports we saw were printed in various trade journals describing TVA's work with superphosphoric acid. We came to your plant and laboratories at Wilson Dam, and observed the research and development work. Actually, your staff made trials of a number of formulations we were interested in, and they gave us samples for observation. Today our company, under free license from TVA, uses that information and some TVA polyphosphate with commercial wet-process acid in making low cost liquid fertilizer—lower than any other method available to small businesses such as ours. TVA has been the only source of a satisfactory superphosphate which provides the only means for use of wet acid. We take very little credit for achievements in the field of production. We owe most of our success to TVA, and we believe that the industry should recognize TVA for making major contributions to liquid fertilizer technology—the use of which is considerably enhanced by your supplying new materials. Those of us too small to afford technical staffs are particularly grateful recipients of your development information.

Formerly, when majors were in the business of selling independents raw materials, they supplied technical information and did product development work for their customers, the independents. Now, this activity is largely proprietary. So another concern is our inability to keep up in new product development. We, and most of the other small independent fertilizer manufacturers, are almost entirely dependent upon TVA for this important function.

Will we be able to depend on TVA in the future to supply materials not available from industry, and to carry out research and do product development work for the small companies who have no facilities for this type activity? The answer to the above will have considerable bearing on our future planning. We will appreciate your carefully considered opinion.

Sincerely yours,

NELSON O. ASKEL,
President.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SITUATIONS IN VIETNAM AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this morning the President of the

May 4, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500120034-7

9035

United States called to the White House members of three important committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. He pointed out to them the reasons why he felt it necessary for this Nation to stand firm in Vietnam and to evacuate civilians of this Nation and others who were caught in the unfortunate situation that developed in the Dominican Republic.

The President went into considerable detail to explain the problems in both those instances and indicated how much he felt the support of the Congress and of the American people was needed in the effort of the Chief Executive to maintain peace in the world and in defending those who have common interests with us against Communist subversion and Communist overthrow.

This Senator was pleased to see the standing ovation from the large number of Representatives and Senators who were members of those important committees when the President explained this Nation's position and the steps that had been taken to seek peace and to preserve the liberty of this Nation and that of friendly nations.

The President asked that we appropriate an additional \$700 million to pay the expense of the defense of freedom in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

I am pleased to see that congressional leaders—both in the Senate and in the House—have given assurances that the President's request will be considered in short order. I would hope no Member of Congress would vote to deny our men the necessary weapons and support to carry out their orders to protect this Nation's vital interests. Therefore, I hope that Congress will vote for the appropriation by an overwhelming majority.

The show of unity behind the President's position in providing funds for these basic needs and for our fighting forces will make an impression on those who think that through terrorist tactics, by the murder of innocent civilians, by attack on our installations, they can keep pressure on this Nation, and that by so doing they will cause this Nation to capitulate in its efforts to preserve freedom and to preserve the position of all free nations on the earth.

There are some who differ with the President's policies. Perhaps some can find some reason for disagreement in one detail or another. But there is no doubt in my mind that the overwhelming majority of the American people and the overwhelming majority of Members of the Congress stand solidly behind the President in his efforts to see that no more nations are taken over by the Communist conspiracy in this hemisphere, and that the commitment this Nation has made to preserve freedom around the world will be honored.

Some people understand Americans better than others. There have been a number of showdowns with the Communists who control the Soviet Union. As a result of the firmness which we have evidenced and which their embassies and agents reported back to those in charge in the Soviet Union, I believe they under-

stand the courage, the determination, and conviction of the American people, as well as our commitment to our freedom.

I believe we have persuaded them by our firm position in Berlin, and by the firm position this Nation took in Turkey, Greece, and Cuba, that this Nation will fight. It will fight any sort of war that may be necessary to preserve freedom in this world.

As much as we love peace, we love freedom and liberty even more. Therefore, we have reason to hope and believe that it will not be necessary to engage in a general war with the only power on earth really capable of waging general war against the United States. We do not wish to engage in such a war, and we believe that they do not. As long as they know that America will stand up with courage, under any circumstances, to protect its vital interests and its liberties, we have every reason to believe that such a war can be avoided.

Sometimes the United States gains the impression that the Chinese Communists still remain to be convinced. We do not wish to use any more force than necessary to convince that huge nation that we seek no war with anyone, but that we will defend the areas we are committed to defend and will defend them with whatever force may be necessary.

I believe that the Chinese Communists are coming to the conviction that that is, indeed, the position of the United States. They are coming to understand us a little better as a result of the strong position which the President has taken in regard to South Vietnam.

Sometimes, unfortunately, the press makes it appear—and perhaps some Senators and Representatives also make it appear—that America does not have the determination to stand fast, and that if the pressure is kept up against us, we might relent in our determination to defend freedom.

In my judgment, anyone who believes that is greatly mistaken. A minority which might differ with the President's views can sometimes be made to look much larger and more influential than it is, but Congress has voted on this issue time and again, and by huge majorities has voted the funds to continue the operation of our armed services to carry on the defense of freedom and prevent enslavement by aggressors from any source whatsoever.

Consequently, I applaud the President's statement this morning. I was pleased to notice that he received overwhelming standing applause from the more than 100 Senators and Representatives who listened to the explanation of his position.

There is no doubt in my mind that the appropriation recommended by the President will receive overwhelming support, that while some Senators may differ in small degree, all Senators share the same desire as to what the United States ultimately wishes; namely, peace. I believe that the great majority of Senators are completely satisfied that even though some may have minor differences as to

the precise measure that should be used to defend freedom, few, if any, would have the United States renege on its commitments. Few, if any, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives would have America stand idly by at the prospect of a friendly nation being overwhelmed and driven into some form of Communist slavery, and do nothing to help that friendly nation defend its liberties.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Let me compliment my friend the assistant majority leader for his great foresight and understanding of the situation which confronts us in Vietnam. I am happy to know that he has uttered words of support for the President and the President's request for \$700 million additional for the Armed Forces of our Nation.

As the Senate knows, I have just returned from Vietnam. I have talked with the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] on this subject. It was an uplifting experience to witness the reaction of Members of Congress to the President's explanation of his position, one of the most heartening and encouraging events I have ever witnessed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The President made a statement this morning which has been made by many others. I do not claim that the President is the first one to have said it, but I know he fully believes that whenever this Nation has stood firm, particularly when we have armed ourselves adequate to the task and let it be known that we would do whatever was necessary to defend freedom, we have prevailed. We have had difficulty when we left our antagonists in doubt as to our intentions. Our adversaries are beginning to have some understanding that American thought in this field has crystallized to the extent that Americans know the President has a great burden upon his shoulders, and the country will support him.

Mr. DODD. I quite agree with the able and distinguished Senator from Louisiana. He and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], also know that I have recently completed an extensive tour of the Far East, which has given me the opportunity to obtain a first-hand look at the war in Vietnam, what I call the auxiliary war in Laos, and the Indonesian confrontation with Malaysia.

At a later date, I will report to the Senate in more detail on that trip.

In anticipation of the more complete statement which I intend to present, I want to say at this juncture that the war in Vietnam is now going much better for our side.

There are many evidences of this.

The Vietnamese Armed Forces have in recent months inflicted very heavy losses on the Vietcong. The Government forces are taking more prisoners, capturing more weapons, receiving more defec-

May 4, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500120034-7

tors, unearthing more Communist caches of arms and ammunition and rice.

There are certain parts of the country where the situation is still precarious. But there are important regions which have witnessed dramatic improvement.

I spent the better part of a week in Vietnam and in Laos, moving from point to point by helicopter and plane. I had lengthy discussions with many of the people in that area, with our great Ambassador, Maxwell Taylor—who, I believe is one of the truly great Americans of our time—and with his brilliant assistant, Alexis Johnson, and members of the Embassy staff; with General Westmoreland and his senior officers. As the Senator from Mississippi knows, he is one of our really outstanding great soldiers, a man of great character and ability. I also had a lengthy discussion with Prime Minister Quat and his cabinet.

I was impressed and, indeed, deeply moved, by the dedication of our Embassy personnel, our AID officials, and the American officers and GI's serving in Vietnam.

There are no faint hearts among the Americans in Vietnam, no voices crying for withdrawal because the war is too difficult or the burden too great.

On the contrary, everyone I met in Vietnam, from Ambassador Taylor and General Westmoreland down to the rank of private, was convinced that the war could be won and determined that it must be won.

I met many soldiers from Connecticut at the DaNang airbase. I talked with them alone. Their officers were not present. Our soldiers know why they are in Vietnam. They wish to stay there. This made such a deep impression upon me that I shall never forget it.

Volunteers man the helicopters—helicopters with open doors, machineguns at hand, leaning out and guarding against the Communist Vietcong. They are all volunteer American soldiers, every single one of them. Not one of them ever said that he wished to go home. I heard that some had asked to have their tour of duty extended so that they could stay on the job.

I also wish to tell the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Mississippi and all my colleagues in the Senate that wherever I went in Asia I met with the most enthusiastic approval of President Johnson's twin commitment to freedom and peace in southeast Asia. Indeed, I am convinced that American prestige among the countries of the Far East has never been higher than it is today. I talked with heads of state in every country. I talked with our people there. I talked with many other people. I tried to see and hear as much as I could.

I asked those people, "What do you think? Do you think what we are doing is on the right track?" Without exception the answer was, "Yes." It was unanimously in the affirmative.

They are all outstanding people, and they are doing an outstanding job for the free world.

I earnestly hope that Congress will move expeditiously to appropriate the supplementary funds requested by the President.

Mr. President, I would like to say a few words, too, about the situation in the Dominican Republic because I am convinced that it represents a Communist maneuver to divert some of our attention and some of our forces from Vietnam.

I believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people heartily applaud President Johnson's prompt and courageous action in dealing with the Dominican crisis.

So long as there appeared to be a possibility that the revolution was simply directed against the military junta, President Johnson adhered to a hands-off policy. But when it became clear beyond the possibility of doubt that hard-core Communist elements were in effective control of both the political and military aspects of the revolution, the President was confronted with an invidious choice—a choice which no President of the United States could have resolved in another manner.

The free nations of the Americas cannot afford a second Cuba in the Caribbean Sea. A Castro regime in the Dominican Republic would constitute a grave long-term threat to the security of all our nations, and an immediate threat to the political stability of the Latin nations of the hemisphere.

The great majority of those who participated in the Dominican revolution are certainly not Communists. But the hard experience of Cuba teaches us that a handful of Communists occupying the command positions can impose their will in defiance of a disorganized, undisciplined, democratic majority.

I wish to present for the consideration of my colleagues a few essential facts which I received from an authoritative source concerning the Communist role in the Dominican crisis.

Among the rebel forces, and playing an important role in organizing the rebels as well as carrying on much of the paramilitary action are 68 identified, prominent Communist and Castroist leaders.

They include 18 persons known or reliably reported to have been trained in subversive and paramilitary tactics by the Cuban Intelligence Service or other similar Cuban organizations; and 40 who have been reliably and clearly identified over the past few years as Communist and Castroist subversives.

Playing a key role in the tactical direction of the rebel forces is Manuel Gonzales-Gonzalez, an experienced Spanish Communist Party activist who has been working with the Dominican Communist Party for at least the past 2 years.

There are three Communist political organizations involved. They are the Partido Socialista Popular Dominicano—PSPD, Dominican Popular Socialist Party—which follows Moscow's direction; the Movimiento Popular Dominicano—MPD, Dominican Popular Movement—a small but aggressive Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party which follows the Chinese Communist ideological line; and the Agrupacion Politica Catorce de Junio—APCJ, 14th of June political group—the largest of the three which is known to have connections with

the Soviet, Cuban and Communist Chinese regimes.

Following the coup against former President Bosch in 1963, the APCJ and the MPD launched an open guerrilla warfare movement in the hinterland of the Dominican Republic.

Some Dominicans known to have received training in Cuba took part in that abortive effort.

The bulk of the captured rebels were deported in May 1964, and most of them became political exiles in France. From there, many have since traveled in the Soviet bloc countries, including Cuba, and Communist China, returning to the Dominican Republic recently.

Since they were generally leaders of ability and standing, and moreover had the benefit of recent training and orientation, they have been able to reorganize their parties in preparation for an opportunity such as the present crisis presents.

At the outset of the coup d'état attempt, within 1 or 2 hours of the first rebel moves, members of the Castroist June 14 movement were already busy in the streets of Santo Domingo calling on the populace to come out and demonstrate in favor of the call for restoration of constitutional government by ex-President Bosch.

Communist and Castroist leaders shortly thereafter got quantities of arms and ammunition from the magazines of the "27 February" Camp outside Santo Domingo, where rebelling Army officers had seized control as the opening act of the coup.

A sizable quantity of arms and ammunition fell into the hands of leaders of the PSPD—orthodox Communists—and the members of this party were quickly formed into armed paramilitary teams which fanned out in the downtown and "barrio"—slum—areas, taking control of secondary targets and organizing the inhabitants.

Such PSPD leaders as Buenaventura Johnson and Fidelio Despradel were particularly active in organizing these teams.

At the same time a party military headquarters was established and arms collected from loyalist police and military were stored there. Other strong-points were organized.

Also leading the organization of extreme leftist-paramilitary units were Jaime Duran, who received paramilitary training in Cuba in 1962, and Juan Ducoudray, who has been a liaison link between Cuba and the Dominican Republic for the supply of weapons.

All of these actions are believed to have been directed under the generalship of Manuel Gonzalez Gonzalez.

With their relatively tight discipline and effective organization, the extreme leftist groups, particularly the PSPD, but also, prominently, the MPD and the June 14 movement, were soon providing a significant portion of the rebel forces and were decisively influencing the political leadership of the rebellion which, in the beginning, had been in the hands of the Bosch party leaders.

Extreme leftists took control of Radio Santo Domingo and operated in typical Castro style, parading captured loyalists

before television cameras and haranguing viewers with slogans and denunciations of "the bourgeois reactionaries, imperialists," and so forth.

By April 27 the provisional government formed by Rafael Molina Urena contained members and officials who were either established Communist or Castroist personages or had histories of association with the extreme left. Among these were Luis H. Lajara Gonzalez, a Trujilloist who subsequently switched to the Castroist camp, and Alfredo Gonde Pausa, a well-known sympathizer with the PSPD, whose two sons are PSPD members.

This was the complexion of the rebellion when the original PRD leaders, who had organized the revolt to restore Bosch, realizing that their movement had been captured by the Castroist and Communist left, took asylum and by this action renounced their by now largely nominal leadership.

There is little room for doubt that the PRD civilian leaders of the revolt, with the exception of Bosch—who is not in the scene and lacks firsthand knowledge—have all at least privately recognized the capture of their revolt by the extreme left. No civilian PRD leaders of any significance remain with the rebels. Most if not all have taken sanctuary in various embassies and private houses in Santo Domingo.

Rafael Molina Urena is in asylum in the Colombian Embassy.

Jose Francisco Pena Gomez is in hiding in the home of a friend.

Martinez Francisco, PRD secretary general, publicly exhorted the rebels to lay down their arms.

After he had withdrawn from the revolt and taken refuge, Pena Gomez, who had been one of the chief architects of the revolt, informed an American Embassy officer that he considered his movement to have been defeated. He said that the Communists who joined the rebel force infiltrated into positions of importance and that it was very difficult to stop them. In his withdrawal, Pena recognized that the only other alternative would have been to support a bare-faced Castroist grab for power.

This recognition was summed up implicitly by the PRD secretary general, Martinez Francisco, in his radio address to the nation from San Isidro on April 28:

I beg all to lay down their arms, turning them in to the nearest military post, because this is no longer a fight between political parties.

It is only against this background that President Johnson decided that he had no alternative but to intervene.

It is my earnest hope that the Organization of American States will heed the President's request and will at an early date dispatch an inter-American force to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of restoring order in that unhappy country and of creating the conditions essential for stable and democratic government.

Meanwhile, I hope the Senate will move rapidly to demonstrate that in the cause of freedom we are prepared to pay any price.

I have said, because I believe it to be true, that the outbreak in the Dominican Republic is directly tied to our struggle in southeast Asia to defend the freedom and independence of the people of Vietnam.

I predict that we can expect more of this in one place after another and that we must be prepared for it, and that we must do everything in our power to strengthen the President's hand.

If we do not now stand strong, we shall stand weak at a later and more terrible hour.

Some friends have said to me, "Laos and Vietnam do not seem to be the right place."

In reply I have said, "They will have to do. There is no better place, and it is best that we make our stand now."

As the Senator from Louisiana has so well pointed out, every time we have stood firm, we have come out all right. And I am confident that we shall come out all right this time if we stand firm—in Vietnam, in Laos, in the Dominican Republic, all around the world, with our free friends and allies.

The President is not only committed to standing firm, as he has amply demonstrated, but he is committed just as strongly to this quest for peace.

I recall that I was in Korea and, later in the same day, in Taiwan, when the President made his speech in Baltimore about unconditional discussions.

The headlines had to do with that part of his speech in which he spoke of unconditional discussions. They ignored the President's total commitment to the freedom of Vietnam and southeast Asia. I said to those who expressed misgivings, "Read the whole speech." Of course, we are for unconditional discussions because we are ready at any time to sit down and talk with those who are in a position to stop this fighting and to end this war with justice for all.

That is our hope and our only purpose; and it should never be understood as a weakness.

I could not be more pleased that he is. No man wants war. No man wants to see people killed. But no man wants to see the whole world committed to Communist slavery. That, I believe, is the issue.

So I join with the Senator from Louisiana in his support of the President. I shall do all I can to help bring about the quick enactment of the proposed legislation which he has requested.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has made a fine contribution to this Nation's foreign policy. It is an honor to serve with him on the Foreign Relations Committee. His recommendations down through the years have been wise. He has advocated that we stand firm in the face of aggression. His philosophy generally has meant that when those who would destroy and deny freedom strike us, we should strike back harder. If they should strike again, we should strike back even harder. That is the policy that our Nation is pursuing. We do not wish to use any more force than is necessary, but we shall use whatever force is necessary to defend freedom in this world. Our enemies should

be well aware that when they decide to resort to additional methods to destroy freedom and strike at additional nations, we expect to use other measures available to us. I hope that we can have more help and support from friendly nations which realize this problem.

At the present time our Nation is doing its job and is doing it well. We shall succeed because we have a leader who has the vision, the courage, and the wisdom to realize what our problem is, and because the people have the good judgment to follow that leader.

Mr. DODD. I should like to add one thing, if the Senator will yield further.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I think it would be of great interest to the Senator from Louisiana and to the Senator from Mississippi.

I have heard in the Senate Chamber, I have read in our newspapers, I have heard on the radio, and I have heard people on television say, "Those people in Vietnam do not have any interest in freedom. They are not willing to fight for themselves."

I was astonished, amazed, and proud to learn that 80 percent of the armed forces of South Vietnam are volunteers. That is something to think about in any country. They have suffered terrible losses but they inflicted much greater losses on the enemy.

I was amazed, also, to hear from our Air Force people. I asked them, "Do they have any pilots?"

They said, "Do they have any pilots? They have about 800 crack pilots and they will soon have more than 1,000. And they are wonderful pilots."

More importantly, perhaps, they told me that their record on the maintenance and serviceability of aircraft is at least as good as ours. That is something to think about—these people of whom it is said that they do not wish to fight for their freedom.

I went into some little hamlets and villages where I met the mayors and the village chiefs, and I found that in most instances the third or fourth or even the sixth or seventh in the line of succession. Their predecessors have had their throats cut by the Communists in Vietcong attacks, most of the time at night.

So I said to one of them, "You are a pretty brave fellow. Where I come from it would be hard to find a community in which you could get a man to run for mayor when five of his predecessors had had their throats cut." And I think it is true.

But they do not have trouble finding replacements in Vietnam.

This is the kind of people with whom we are fighting, and I think that the American people ought to know it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is also important to realize that for every casualty we have suffered, for every American who has lost his life in Vietnam, many Vietnamese have sacrificed their lives in attempting to defend freedom. I believe their loss of lives have run about 30,000 killed. This would indicate that 30 lives of Vietnamese have been sacrificed on the altar of freedom for every one that our Nation has given in defending free-

dom against CIAApprovedForRelease2003/10/15

that area.

Mr. DODD. That does not take into account the thousands who have been kidnaped. The kidnaping that is going on in this war is a terrible thing. The Communists move in at night. They grab the children and the wives of these brave people and take them off. God knows where, probably never to be heard from again.

Most men would rather die than suffer that disaster. But those men continue the fight.

Our people have no idea of what is going on in this distant place from us or of the courage of those who are continuing to fight on with our support.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I commend the Senator from Connecticut for his decision to go to Vietnam and the other areas he visited. I feel that he has rendered his country, the Congress, and, more particularly, the Senate, a great service. I am one of those who look forward to his formal speech, in which he will give us a report and a comprehensive review of his impressions as well as his recommendations. He is peculiarly fitted to go, and I think he has served his country well. I hope that the Senator can deliver his speech some time soon, with some prior advance notice.

Mr. DODD. I assure the Senator I shall do so.

I am deeply grateful for the Senator's compliment. I do not deserve it, but I am vain enough to enjoy it.

Mr. STENNIS. It is quite a chore which the Senator performed, from a physical standpoint. His services are valuable.

If the Senator from Louisiana will yield to me further, I should like to commend him for his remarks with reference to Vietnam and the bill which we shall shortly consider with reference to a proposed special authorization and appropriation, and the firmness of the stand of the President, not only with reference to Vietnam, but also in reference to the Dominican Republic. Such firm stands put us on the way to a better position, not only for us, but also the world. I look forward to his presentation in the Senate when those questions arise. The Senator's remarks were very good indeed. I do not believe that we have anything to fear so long as we follow a policy of decision, firmness, and action, although, of course, we certainly do not wish any more war or bloodshed than is absolutely necessary.

But we are certainly living in troublous times, and we must meet the situations as they arise, like them or not. I believe that this time we will.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to join in the well-deserved compliment that the Senator from Mississippi has paid to the Senator from Connecticut. I agree with him 100 percent that the Senator from Connecticut has rendered the Nation a great service.

Likewise, the Senator from Mississippi has rendered the country valiant

revered chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL). During the recovery of Senator RICHARD RUSSELL from his illness, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) has been serving as the acting chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and has done so in an outstanding manner. I have had the opportunity to hear him manage bills that have come from the Committee on Armed Services. He is carrying on in a style of which the Nation can be proud. I know that our distinguished chairman [Mr. RUSSELL] will join me in expressing gratitude to the Senator from Mississippi for the excellent work he has done as acting chairman of the Committee on Armed Services during this period.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. We are delighted to know that Senator RUSSELL's health is improving, and we look forward to his early return. The Senator from Georgia started on my service on the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from Louisiana was himself a valued member of that committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was a great honor for me to serve on the Committee on Armed Services. I was a dear mate of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], whose sound judgment transcended party lines with respect to our military and foreign relations problems throughout the years. I appreciate what he has said.

I believe it should also be noted for the Record that the President of the United States, before sending American troops to the Dominican Republic, day after day called upon the contending sides for a ceasefire. He did not want to send American troops to the Dominican Republic. But neither did he want to see innocent men, women, and children—civilians—who were not parties to the contending sides of that struggle, needlessly sacrificed.

Also, the President did not want to see a Communist takeover of that island. He sought to avoid that by sending American troops and by repeatedly calling for a ceasefire prior to the sending of those troops. It was only when a ceasefire could not be arranged that the President decided it was necessary to use American troops.

As one Member of this body—and I think I speak generally on behalf of the Senate—I believe it would have been preferable that forces of the Organization of American States should have been available to accomplish the task which this Nation has found it necessary to undertake. We hope, even at this point, that the Organization of American States, through the governments acting individually, will be able to participate in restoring democratic government to the Dominican people.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two significant items which

referred last Wednesday, April 28. The first is an article captioned "Field Commander Johnson," written by the veteran columnist, Joseph Alsop. The second is an editorial bearing the caption "Bridges Versus People." It was published on the same date in the Washington Daily News.

Mr. Alsop, in his article, describes the intense personal interest which the President, as commander in chief, is devoting to the conduct of the Vietnamese war. He points out that all targets are personally approved by the President, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. He says that when planes have gone on a mission, the President will frequently stay awake or will have himself called, so that he can hear the results of the mission as soon as it is completed.

When pilots are missing—

Mr. Alsop wrote—
he has been known to stay awake through the small hours, to sweat out the final recovery of the missing men by the air-sea rescue service.

From my recent travels around Asia, I concur wholeheartedly in Mr. Alsop's estimate that the President "looms much larger in the world today than on the day of his triumphant reelection."

Everywhere I traveled in the Far East, I was met with the conviction that the free world has found a leader with a mettle to match that of the men of Moscow and Peking.

The Washington Daily News editorial referred to President Johnson's expressed wonderment over people who are more disturbed by our bombing of bridges in North Vietnam than they are over the Vietcong murders of women and children. I share fully the President's wonderment; and this is a subject to which I intend to address myself at an early date on the floor of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 28, 1965]

FIELD COMMANDER JOHNSON

(By Joseph Alsop)

For members of the White House staff, a fairly common morning greeting nowadays is a hint that they are slug-a-beds compared to their master, who is perfectly likely to announce: "I was up at 3, waiting to make sure that all my boys got back from that mission."

It is hard to believe, but it is a fact that the President follows the bombing missions attacking targets in North Vietnam almost in the manner of a field commander.

He is customarily notified when the planes have gone out. He often stays up, or has himself called, or is awakened by his own internal alarm clock, to hear the mission's results. And when pilots are missing, he has been known to stay awake through the small hours to sweat out the final recovery of the missing men by the air-sea rescue service.

All this is decidedly sympathetic, although someone ought to persuade the President that it is quite unnecessary. He has been looking a bit tired recently, and no wonder. For his new role as a field commander of operations halfway around the world must clearly cut substantially into his always minimal daily allowance of rest.

But persuading Lyndon B. Johnson to mend his ways, for his own good or for any

THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN
REPUBLIC

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, we cannot suffer the existence of another Cuba at our shores in the Caribbean. The mistake that was made about Castro must not and should not be repeated. In 1956, the American public was mislead into believing that Castro was a Robin Hood taking from the rich and giving to the poor. We allowed Castro to be given the image of a friend of the United States of America. In 1944, the public was also deceived by being made to believe that the interference with Chiang Kai-shek's government in China was a

DR

revolt of the oppressed "peasant" wanting to be liberated from an oppressive and exploiting government.

Now it is argued that in Santo Domingo those seeking the overthrow of the existing government are friendly non-Communists desirous only of improving the welfare of the people. The overwhelming evidences are that the Communists have taken hold. Idly standing by while Castroism is being expanded would in the end require the paying of a costly, painful price.

The President, in my opinion, is right in what he is doing. He is acting in the long-range interest of the security of our country. To follow a different course in regard to the situation in the Dominican Republic would be equal to a collaboration by our Government in the expansion of communism in the Western Hemisphere. The Dominican Republic is practically at our southern shores. To suffer another Castro government at our very shores is unthinkable and cannot and should not become a reality.

A FAIR APPRAISAL OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in this country there is too much tendency to blame the State Department for most of our oversea trouble. This is most unfortunate, especially since our State Department is largely composed of highly competent and dedicated public servants. America would still have many foreign problems, even if the State Department were the best organized body in the world, and even if every American official were a foreign-policy genius.

John M. Hightower, of the Associated Press, is certainly one of the best newsmen covering the State Department. Recently, he wrote an excellent article describing the working of our State Department. As Mr. Hightower has correctly commented:

However comforting the far perspective may be, the State Department wrestles daily with the other view—a world of troubles. One of the most surprising facts about it is, not that it makes mistakes or agonizes over divided counsels, but that it works at all.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, as published in the April 25 issue of the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Apr. 25, 1965]

WRESTLING WITH A WORLD OF TROUBLES IS STATE DEPARTMENT'S DAILY ROUTINE
(By John M. Hightower, AP special correspondent)

WASHINGTON.—The State Department's long range planning master, Walter Rostow, published a hopeful book about international relations last year under the title "The View From the Seventh Floor."

The seventh floor is where Dean Rusk and other executives of the foreign policy factory have their offices.

The view, as reported by Policy Planning Director Rostow, is not too bad when focused on the distant goals of peace, international order and higher living standards over the world.

Another view from the seventh floor is more squint eyed, less optimistic. In the short range it focuses on burning libraries, ink splattered embassies, war in southeast Asia, crises in the Middle East, quarrels with and among the Communists and a stack of other unsolved and presently insoluble problems.

However comforting the far perspective may be, the State Department wrestles daily with the other view—a world of troubles. One of the most surprising facts about it is not that it makes mistakes or agonizes over divided counsels but that it works at all.

FOCUS ON QUARRELS

On the home front it is accountable to 193 million Americans, who constantly disagree about foreign policy. Abroad it deals with 113 foreign countries which frequently quarrel with each other and the United States. If the country scores a military victory the credit is likely to go to the Defense Department. If it scores a diplomatic victory, the credit is likely to go to the White House.

Since the end of World War II no one has ever figured out a broadly acceptable way even to organize the State Department. For instance during the last 20 years control of the foreign aid program, the foreign information program and disarmament policy has been periodically put into and removed from the Department.

If this suggests a certain confusion over the best way to handle the Nation's foreign relations, it also suggests that the world with which the State Department must deal 24 hours a day is in a confusing state that constantly threatens to become worse rather than better.

It is no longer so simple as it was, for example, when all major power was divided between Moscow and Washington.

Today the Communist bloc is split into two big chunks and several fragments and the Atlantic Alliance is hardly less divided. France is pursuing independent policies that have all but destroyed the old trans-Atlantic dream of a united Europe and United States applying their energies for the same goals of trade, peace and growing world unity.

In the last 20 years also the State Department has had seven secretaries under four Presidents and each one has had quite different ideas about how to run the place.

BYRNES BLOCKED MOVE

In 1946 James F. Byrnes blocked a plan to move the Department from its ancient home inside the White House to a more modern and spacious building six blocks away in Washington's Foggy Bottom. In 1947, George Marshall ordered the move as one of his first acts after taking over the State Department.

Six years later John Foster Dulles, entering the Eisenhower Cabinet, wanted to move his own office back to Pennsylvania Avenue, next door to the President, not by transplanting the whole Department but by separating its head—himself—from its body. He was talked out of this with great difficulty.

Dean Rusk, coming into office with President John F. Kennedy, promised to break the pattern of almost constant travel set by Dulles and Dean Acheson. He said the chief U.S. foreign policymaker should stay home more and think. But in a few months he was flying faster and farther than any of his predecessors.

Rusk has delegated great authority to his assistant secretaries and has seen radical changes in the way the Department operates during his own 4 years there.

In his first year he found that President Kennedy often ran foreign policy from his White House office on specific issues as the Congo, perhaps, or Cuba or southeast Asia. President Johnson has reversed all that. He operates through Rusk or, in his absence,

through Under Secretary of State George Ball.

PRESIDENT OFTEN STEPS IN

The vastly different Rusk relationship with Johnson and with Kennedy illustrate a point which even the careful analysts of the State Department's history and operation sometimes forget. This is that while the Secretary of State is the head of the State Department on the Government's organization charts the President is, or at any given moment may choose to be, the head of the State Department in fact—just as he may choose to be in direct control of any other agency in the Government. This means that when a President with intense interest in foreign affairs—such as John F. Kennedy—takes over the Government the operation of any of the great agencies changes radically from what it had been before.

In President Harry S. Truman's day, by contrast, the State Department was run by a succession of very strong Secretaries to whom Truman delegated great authority so that their recommendations amounted to decisions. That was also essentially the relationship between Dulles and President Dwight D. Eisenhower. President Johnson, while operating in ways quite different from those of President Kennedy, still has not delegated authority to Rusk to the extent that Truman and Eisenhower did, and Rusk, being a more retiring and less aggressive man than some of his predecessors, has not reached out for more power.

The most striking characteristic of the State Department in modern times is the enormous expansion it has undergone, paralleling the increasingly active role the United States has taken in world affairs since the end of World War II. In 1945, the last year of the war, the total of State Department employees stood at 9,880. In 1965 the total is 23,327. During that score of years the United States more than doubled the number of countries with which it has diplomatic relations. The withdrawal of the great European empires from Asia and Africa has brought more than 50 new countries into the world since World War II ended.

BUSY NERVE CENTER

The State Department is the nerve center for a communications system extending all over the world. Its own system, furthermore, is supplemented by the constant flow of news dispatches into Washington and also by information which comes through military channels, and that which is obtained from intelligence sources. By its own communications measure it is an extremely busy place, exchanging 10,000 cables, letters and other reports and messages every day with overseas posts. Its budget, which was once well below \$100 million, is now approaching \$400 million.

Three great organizational changes have been made and developed over the years since the Truman administration to provide a better projection and control of policy. One is the policy planning staff now headed by Rostow, who has an Ivy League academic background and is internationally recognized as an authority on all kinds of policy problems, both political and economic. The first policy planning chief was Ambassador George Kennan, who formulated the policy of containment of Soviet expansion back when the cold war was just beginning.

The second organization which has contributed greatly to the State Department's efficient operation in a secretarial staff, or secretariat, serving the Secretary of State and charged essentially with the task of keeping the flood of papers moving through the decision-making process at the fastest possible speed. This organization also goes back to the Truman administration, having been introduced by George Marshall

as a result of his military experiences with staff organization.

At the top of the policy making structure, with the President himself as the Chairman, stands the National Security Council. This too, was set up in the Truman administration, with the purpose of coordinating the planning and decision making of the White House, State, and Defense Departments.

One of the popular concepts of the State Department operation is that foreign policy is made in orderly fashion, progressing from the idea stage by logical degrees to the point of decision. This does happen, but not very often, at least on the big questions.

IN PRAISE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

MR. CHURCH. Mr. President, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY is one of the hardest-working and most talented Vice Presidents in the history of the United States. He has been a splendid teammate for Lyndon Johnson during the first 100 days of heroic legislative achievements which have marked this first full term. The Vice President's distinguished service has proved that President Johnson made a very wise choice in selecting his running mate last August.

Edward T. Folliard has written an excellent account of HUBERT H. HUMPHREY's first 100 days as Vice President. I ask unanimous consent that this article, which was published in the May 2 issue of the Washington Post, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS NO. 2, HE HAS TO TRY HARDER—100 DAYS AFTER TAKING OFFICE VICE PRESIDENT STILL CAN'T PAUSE TO SMELL FLOWERS

(By Edward T. Folliard, Washington Post staff writer)

After 100 days in office, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY stands out as the hardest-working Vice President in American history. His whirlwind pace would astonish earlier Vice Presidents who said that the job was "insignificant" (John Adams), "honorable and easy" (Thomas Jefferson) and "a bore" (Theodore Roosevelt).

Some of Vice President HUMPHREY's admirers believe that may be working too hard.

He gets up at his home in Chevy Chase at 7:30 a.m. and usually starts his official day with telephone calls. Then he climbs into his limousine and, accompanied by a Secret Service agent, rides from the Maryland suburb to his office in Washington.

"I read all the way downtown, work on my papers," he has said. "I've learned how to use every single minute of the day, every minute."

That gives some idea of the man's zeal, and it also raises a question.

Wouldn't it be better for the Vice President—and the Republic—if he slowed down his limousine, forgot his papers for a while and looked at the flowers that are blooming all over Greater Washington in this spring of 1965?

Undoubtedly it would be, and better still if he got out of his limousine and sniffed the violets.

"The trouble with me," says the Vice President, alluding to the rent-a-car advertisement, "is that I'm only No. 2. I have to try harder."

A SENATORIAL POSSIER

HUMPHREY is one of those extraordinary men who can go full speed and yet come up with worthwhile ideas. It is sometimes forgotten, but it was the then Senator Hum-

PHREY who introduced bills to create the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, a Youth Conservation Corps (now Job Corps), and the Peace Corps. And that was back in the Eisenhower administration.

To say that Vice President HUMPHREY is the hardest working man ever to hold the No. 2 office is not such a sweeping statement as it may sound. For 160 years of our national history, it was not expected that a Vice President would do much more than preside over the Senate, as required by the Constitution.

In the infancy of the Republic, John Adams' disdain for the Vice-Presidency and his love of fancy titles were so well known that a Senator quipped that Adams ought to be called "His Superfluous Excellency." And as recently as the 1940's, President Franklin D. Roosevelt kept Vice President Harry S. Truman in the dark about the atomic bomb.

President Truman himself was without a Vice President for 3 years and 10 months, but when he got one—Alben Barkley, of Kentucky, his running mate in the 1948 election—he made sure that the No. 2 man was more than a fifth wheel. He had Vice President Barkley sit in at Cabinet meetings and also at meetings of the National Security Council. No secrets were withheld from the Kentuckian.

A CUMULATIVE CHORE

President Eisenhower continued this practice with Vice President Richard M. Nixon, although the two men did not know each other very well at the outset; and President Kennedy went even further in the case of Vice President Johnson, giving him such added duties as the chairmanship of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

Now President Johnson has carried the team idea still further with Vice President HUMPHREY, piling a large number of new chores on him. He has, for example, given him a leading role in the war on poverty, assigned him to the "See the U.S.A." program, made him chairman of the President's Council on Equal Opportunity, the civil rights coordinating body, and given him a liaison role with the mayors of the country.

Humphrey has offices in the old State, War, and Navy Building as well as in the Capitol and the Senate Office Building. He feels romantic about the suite across from the White House because it was used by Franklin D. Roosevelt when F.D.R. was Assistant Secretary of the Navy in the Wilson administration.

ENJOYS THE GAVEL

The Vice President likes to open the sessions of the Senate—a duty that most of his predecessors have slighted—and then go to his ornate office of the Senate chamber. There he talks to Senators and Congressmen, and sometimes their constituents.

There are times, however, when his base of operations will be the old Roosevelt suite across from the White House. Thus he began his day there Wednesday at 9:30 a.m., conferring with Eric Wyndham-White, secretary of GAAT, the international organization for tariffs and trade. At 12:30 p.m., he went over the the White House for the swearing in of new officials of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Somehow he managed to get some lunch, and then was dashing out to dedicate the new Veterans' Administration Hospital near Soldiers Home. At 4 p.m. he went to Decatur House to talk to 55 Negro businessmen, and then returned to the White House for a meeting of legislative liaison men from the various departments and agencies.

Then he was off to a party in honor of Representative BARRATT O'HARA of Illinois at the Congressional Hotel. Next he dropped in at a meeting of the National Education Association, and he ended the day speaking at a dinner of the Millers Federation at the Shoreham.

The Vice President flew to Florida for a vacation Easter week, but he cut it short to attend the funeral of Senator Olin Johnston, of South Carolina, at Spartanburg. Next day he flew to New York to open the New York World's Fair.

He travels in a Jet-Star assigned to him by the Air Force. So far his traveling has been limited to the United States, but it is expected that President Johnson will assign him to some good will trips overseas.

HUMPHREY's burden would overwhelm many men of 54, but this one revels in work. In a television interview with Tom Wicker, chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times, HUMPHREY said:

"If you learn how to use your time, you can get an awful lot done—and besides that, I have fun. If you can't have a little fun at it, you ought to quit."

It remains only to be said that the office of Vice President was once so looked down upon that an argument broke out in the First Congress over how much the Vice President was to be paid. A salary of \$5,000 a year was finally approved, but some House Members objected and said that he ought to be paid by the day—and then only for the days he worked.

Vice President HUMPHREY gets \$43,000 a year, plus \$10,000 for expenses, and he earns it.

CRITICAL NEED FOR GI BILL NOW

MR. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the recent announcement, from the White House, that American troops are landing in strife torn Santo Domingo, provides us with one more startling example of the ever-present pressure and the constant demand placed upon the men and women of dedication and courage who serve in the U.S. Armed Forces in these times of cold war turmoil and political unrest. When we are told that more than 14,000 young Americans are risking their very lives, so that political order can be restored in one of our sister republics of this hemisphere, it becomes readily apparent that the life and times of the American fighting man of today constitute a personal burden and a patriotic sacrifice, just as was the valiant and heroic service of the American fighting man of World War II and of the Korean conflict.

If our young men and women of 1965 can offer their time, their energy, their futures, and their lives in the battle for the same freedom and the same ideals for which prior generations fought, why should they not, in the name of justice and fairplay, be offered the same opportunities for education and economic success by the people for whom they fight? The battle against the sinister encroachment of communism and the labors for the victory of freedom and self-determination of nations go on in every part of the globe this day. Skirmishes in Santo Domingo, pressure in Berlin, threats from Cuba, battle in Vietnam, and the rigor of preparation here at home each argue irrefutably that bravery, sacrifice, and dedicated service cannot be limited to activity in a single nation, a small geographical section, or even an entire continent. To the contrary, these instances of service and sacrifice serve to establish the patent fact that dedication and sacrifice in our American Armed Forces are general, not limited; that they are the rule, not the exception.

May 4, 1965

9011

The commandant drove the United Nations vehicle off the road and put the keys in his pocket. These were recovered subsequently when he was killed while Congolese troops were hunting down the rebels including some 50 refugee sympathizers in the Kalonge area.

When the driver reached the house of the Mwami after his escape, he was immediately taken to Bukavu and interrogated by Congolese authorities and by Mr. Johan Kunitzberger, the officer handling administrative matters in the Bukavu office of the United Nations Civil Operation in the Congo (UNOC). Efforts were made at once to determine the fate of Messrs. Plicque and Preziosi, but fighting in the area prevented government patrols from penetrating to Mamba. It was only on August 29 when conditions had become more calm that the Mwami said he had learned where the bodies of the two officials were buried. A search party headed by Dr. Faustino Doglio of the World Health Organization, then the ranking official in Bukavu, set out the same day and soon discovered the bodies, which had been buried with some care in Mamba camp.

Thus taking all known factors into account, it is clear that the overwhelming majority of the refugees who saw Messrs. Preziosi and Plicque being killed had nothing to do with their death and that, on the contrary, many tried to intercede in their favor. Entire responsibility devolves on the commandant, whose brutal action was obviously motivated by the wish to eliminate both a military risk and a threat to his aim of winning over the refugees.

It is assumed that the refugees took the initiative of burying the two victims since their valuables, including wedding rings, were intact when the bodies were recovered.

At the same time, the inquiry has brought out even more forcefully the high sense of duty of Mr. Preziosi and of Mr. Plicque who accompanied him. Far from setting out imprudently they were fully aware of the grave risks involved but considered it their overriding obligation to proceed nonetheless with their efforts to assure the noninvolvement of the refugees.

The funeral was held in Bukavu Cathedral on Monday, August 31, in the presence of Mrs. Plicque and Mrs. Preziosi. They had been waiting in Bujumbura. Mr. Pinegar, the President of the central Kivu Province, the Governor of Bukavu, as well as local United Nations and diplomatic representatives, also attended the interment, which took place in a mission cemetery near Cyanogou just across the frontier in Rwanda.

Messages of sympathy have been received from U Thant, representatives of governments on the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's program, colleagues in UNHCR, United Nations agencies, voluntary agencies, and many individuals.

Dr. Moïse Tshombé, Prime Minister of the Congo, sent a particularly warm cable of condolence on behalf of himself and the government.

Mr. Preziosi, who would have been 43 on August 19, had been the High Commissioner's chargé de mission in Bukavu since the beginning of 1963. His task was to protect some 60,000 Rwandese refugees in the Kivu Province of the Congo and to supervise measures being taken to settle those in need of international assistance. During this period, he acquired a reputation for the vigor with which he carried out his duties and for his tenacity in protecting the refugees against repressive action. At the same time he had won the confidence and respect of the provincial officials. Thus when increasing instability in the Kivu led authorities to impose further restrictions on refugees, including imprisonment, Mr. Preziosi felt that he could play a useful role by remaining at his post, and continuing to defend the interests of the refugees. Since Mr.

Preziosi's death, reports from UNHCR's regional office indicate that refugees whose release Mr. Preziosi was trying to arrange remained in jail and that many did not survive.

In the first week of September when it was reported that 500 refugees were still in jail in the Kivu, Mr. Fritz Pijnacker-Hordijk, of the Bujumbura office, was assigned to Bukavu. Like other United Nations personnel, his living quarters are across the frontier in Rwanda some 7 miles away, and his movements in the Bukavu area are governed by considerations of personal safety. Apart from trying to assure that the refugees in prison are adequately fed, he has continued Mr. Preziosi's efforts to keep outside influences of any kind from threatening the well-being of the refugees and jeopardizing the efforts of the international community to settle them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the situation in Santo Domingo continues to be dangerous and difficult. Innocent persons are still being killed by random bullets and sniper fire. There are reports of an epidemic of dysentery, and an outbreak of cholera is a strong possibility.

U.S. military forces, now numbering 14,000 are risking their lives daily; at least 7 have already died and scores have been wounded. A great many Americans and other foreign nationals have been evacuated, but thousands are still in danger of being caught in the crossfire of the conflict.

The cease-fire, sought initially through the good offices of the Papal Nuncio, Msgr. Emanuele Clarizio, has not yet been firmly established. But his efforts have now been supplemented by those of the OAS five-nation commission and Secretary General Mora. It is my understanding that this inter-American group is in touch with the leadership of the various sources of the Dominican conflict and has been making some progress toward a cease-fire, although an end to the fighting has not yet been brought about.

The Council of the Organization of American States has been meeting daily since last Tuesday, and while agreement was reached to send the Commission under Secretary Mora, the U.S. proposal to inter-Americanize foreign troops in the Dominican Republic has not yet been approved. This would seem to me to be an essential step if the inter-American system is to be effective and is to prevail in this situation. I do not think a great deal in the way of manpower would be required to carry out this resolution. A company of 300 men from each Latin

American nation under its own officers and general OAS command may well suffice, and this Nation could offer to provide emergency logistical support, if necessary.

It would be my hope that the Organization will act rapidly on this U.S. proposal. Once there is an inter-American force on the scene, and a cease-fire has been achieved, I would hope that a temporary OAS trusteeship could be established which would concentrate on holding free and fair elections within 30 to 90 days.

I think we in this Nation and the Latin American nations should be clear on one point: The President of the United States has no desire to keep a unilateral U.S. force in the Dominican Republic 1 day longer than absolutely necessary. The prompt establishment of an inter-American military force would go a long way in permitting us to terminate this difficult responsibility.

I am pleased to note reports that both Brazil and Argentina have announced their willingness to send troops to the Dominican Republic as soon as the OAS approves such an action. I would hope that other Latin American nations will follow the lead of these two great nations in announcing their willingness to make forces available to help stabilize this critical inter-American situation.

I would hope, as well, that all the Latin American Ambassadors in Santo Domingo would join with the U.S. Ambassador or vice versa, and the OAS commission, in assisting in bringing about an effective cease-fire. I well understand the sentiments expressed by Mexican Foreign Minister Antonio Carillo Flores when he said:

We cannot help but comment that, for whatever humanitarian reasons the Government of the United States has invoked, that it was considered necessary to resort to so sorrowful a thing in memory. As a consequence we hope that the presence of U.S. Marines in the Dominican Republic will be the briefest possible.

I can assure him that his hope for the briefest possible presence of American forces is one which is shared by the President of the United States. The President's decision to send them in was taken with great reluctance and only when it became apparent that such an action was essential to safeguard the lives of U.S. citizens and other American nationals as well as foreigners from the rest of the world.

The President has made it clear that U.S. forces are not there to intervene in Dominican politics. The politics of the Republic are matters for the Dominican people alone to resolve, and I hope that it will be possible to do so at the earliest moment. All reports indicate that the U.S. forces have acted with caution and discretion and, in fact, have avoided taking sides in the revolution. They have performed an essential service in evacuating and safeguarding non-Dominicans, and they have been a significant factor in enabling the Red Cross to do its great humanitarian work among the injured and in attempting to prevent the spread of pestilence.

There are grounds for grave concern not only for us but also for all Americans of this hemisphere over the Dominican developments. If there was ever a time when precipitous judgments should be eschewed here and in the other American Republics, it is now. The need is for cool heads, for restraint and for the most measured and carefully designed inter-American action. At stake is not only the hope of the Dominican people for a responsible, stable, and decent system of free government, but also the efficacy of the inter-American system which has been a century in building. The situation in the Dominican Republic is in every sense a hemispheric responsibility. The OAS must have every opportunity to meet that responsibility. It must not fail to meet that responsibility.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as usual, the statement of our majority leader is very timely and important. It appears that the situation in the Dominican Republic came to the attention of most of the country, at least, unexpectedly. One thing I would like to point out, however, is that the situation in the Dominican Republic cannot be considered in the same light as the situation in southeast Asia. In the case of the Dominican Republic the President had to act quickly. I do not know to what extent he advised other Western Hemispheric nations that he was taking this action. Certainly they found it out soon afterward. I believe there was no time for the convening of the Organization of American States and getting that Organization into action if the people not only from the United States but from many other countries were to be protected in the Dominican Republic.

I think, however, that we may have been a little callous with regard to this small republic, which has only 3 or 4 million people. The economy of that country has apparently been deteriorating. The fall of the world sugar market dealt them a tremendous blow.

Several weeks ago I read that the biggest sugar plant, at Campinas, had been closed and the largest sugar plantation in the world had been closed. I have also heard that other employers had laid off their employees.

Any rebellion must have something to feed on. Unemployment is what it feeds on best. It seems to me that that is a situation that precipitated or hastened the rebellion in the Dominican Republic.

I am glad to hear that other countries in the Western Hemisphere are indicating a willingness to participate in restoring a workable government in that country. The OAS should contribute to the best of its ability in establishing such a restoration. I realize that it would be impossible to get the member nations of the OAS to unanimously agree to make a contribution of men or equipment or anything else, because some of them have, I believe, a very sincere policy against becoming involved in the affairs of any other country.

I hope, now that we are undertaking not only to restore order but also to reduce hostilities to a minimum in that area, that we will do it as soon as possible. When that is done I suggest that we pay more attention to the economy of that country. I suspect that we could have headed off this rebellion had we been fully aware of the effects of the depression which was affecting this country. Those people have to live, they have to eat, and they have to work. I know that we have criticized Trujillo, but while he was the dictator, the country was quite prosperous. No corporation was permitted to lay off its help without having an excellent reason for doing it. They had to get permission to lay off their help. Conditions are changed now. The situation was ripe for rebellion.

I do not undertake to say just what should be done, because the situation is in a state of flux.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that we may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Before I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York, I should like to say, as always, that the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the senior Republican in the Senate, has made a significant contribution. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has a special interest in Latin American affairs. He issues reports from time to time which in my opinion are "must" reading for anyone who wants to have a better understanding and a deeper understanding of the areas which he has visited.

What he has said about unemployment in the Dominican Republic is absolutely correct. One of the reasons why the late chief of state, Donald Reid Cabral was overthrown, I believe, was due to the fact that he tried to institute an austerity program. When that is done, on an economy which is drastically hurt, a situation is created which is very difficult to overcome.

I think it should be said in all honesty that beginning a week ago Saturday, I believe, when the revolution broke out, our Government established contact with the OAS and on its own initiative and through the OAS urged with others that this affair be brought up for consideration, and in that manner performed its function as a member state.

I believe that what the Senator from Vermont has said is true; namely, that when the President took this action in dispatching American marines to Santo Domingo, the OAS was not informed, and that the President acted as he did only because of the urgency of the information sent him by our Ambassador, Mr. Bennett and various other chiefs within the American missions there.

The President felt that the need was imperative to bring about the evacuation of Americans and other nationals. It is my understanding as of this morning, based on what the President said to the membership of 6 congressional committees, that there were approximately

5,000 nationals, other than Dominicans, still in the Republic, and that of the 5,000, 1,500 were Americans.

It is my hope that, as the Senator from Vermont has indicated so ably, the OAS would assume its responsibility and recognize that this is not a U.S. problem but an inter-American problem, and in doing so I would hope they would consider the possibility of setting up a trusteeship down there under OAS auspices and creating an inter-American police force, to which each nation, including the United States, would contribute 300 men; and that the officer in command of such a force would be other than an officer from this country.

I would also like to see a greater degree of collaboration between the ambassadors of the American States, so that, instead of one country, like our own, acting unilaterally in Santo Domingo, all the American ambassadors there would get together and consider matters cooperatively.

These are factors which I am sure are being given every consideration.

With that premise, and in response to the observations made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, I am ready to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I have 1 more minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Please.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the President of the United States had to act quickly in sending the marines into the Dominican Republic to prevent the loss of life. I am sure of that. Now that the situation is as it is there, and we have 14,000 members of our Defense Establishment in the Dominican Republic, I earnestly hope that the President will not try to tie the South Vietnam situation and the Dominican Republic situation together, because they are very distinct from one another.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the present discussion of the Dominican Republic situation may continue for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, while the action of the Dominican Republic is quite generally supported by the public of the United States, I believe that the operations in southeast Asia enjoy considerably less approval. Therefore, I hope that the President does not try to tie those two situations together, because they are distinct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They are two separate entities.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

May 4, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I have a rather important question I should like to ask the majority leader. First, I should like to qualify myself by saying that I was one of those who went to President Bosch's inauguration with our now Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. I also tried to help the Bosch regime by arranging for 1,500,000 doses of antipolio vaccine to be sent to his country. The vaccine was sent free, including the transport by Pan American Airways, and the doses were actually administered through the efforts of the U.S. Public Health Service to the children of the Dominican Republic, in the hope of buttressing that regime.

The point that is troubling me and, I believe, many others, concerns the question of not taking sides, which the Senator mentioned specifically in his very fine and typically thoughtful statement.

The President has announced that we are in the Dominican Republic in order to save Americans, to save other nationals, and to prevent a Communist takeover. I thoroughly agree with the President about preventing a Communist takeover—which assumes that there is danger of one. I also agree with the Senator with respect to the OAS and all the procedures which he has outlined.

But I should like to ask the Senator a question. The Senator said—and I think I heard him correctly—that we must eschew immediate judgment in this situation. Does the Senator, who as majority leader is of great importance in these discussions, feel that the door is open for the United States to withdraw from the situation, considering the attitude that may be adopted by the OAS and knowing what so many of us do know about what evidence there is—at least so far as it has been reported to us—of the likelihood of a Communist takeover? In other words, if we eschew immediate judgment, may not our judgment be to stay in? I must say to the Senator right now that I am all with the President, as I have always been, when we were in a tight spot. I am with him now, and I pledge that. But I ask the Senator whether, in his judgment, we really have freedom of action in this situation, notwithstanding what has been said and done already. If the Senator feels that we do, I believe it would make a very great difference in how the whole situation is regarded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, because of circumstances, our freedom of action is very limited. That is why I have emphasized several times my hope that the OAS would assume its responsibilities and step in and take over some of the responsibility, thereby relieving us of the unilateral responsibility which is ours, and transferring the burden of finding a settlement to the situation in Santo Domingo onto the shoulders of the organization which ostensibly is charged with concern for the welfare of all the states of the Americas. Whether or not that can be done I do not know. There are several resolutions in the OAS which will be considered today and tomorrow. Perhaps out of those three or four resolutions will come a composite resolution

combining the best in each to the end that a settlement may be arrived at.

The Senator has mentioned President Bosch, who was deposed by the coup d'état which was led by a triumvirate, which included Wessin y Wessin, the deposed chief of state Donald Reid Cabral, and one other individual whose name I cannot recall at the present moment. It is my understanding—and this is subject to a good deal of verification because I cannot vouch for it—there was a report this morning to the effect that the Dominican Congress had assembled and had indicated that it would like to see Col. Francisco Caamano Deno, who seems to be the leader of the pro-Bosch forces in the older part of the city of Santo Domingo, become the President on an interim basis. Whether there is anything to that or not, I have no verification. It is a rumor which I have picked up. But there again I hope that it will be possible, if any action of the kind proposed is undertaken, for the OAS to participate in it as fully as possible.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask another question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator say—and I am not trying to put words in the Senator's mouth, but attempting to see if I understand the Senator correctly—that the policy of the United States today is in the following three parts:

First, to guarantee the security, so far as we can, of our own nationals and other foreign nationals there?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Second, to prevent another Communist takeover in the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That question has been raised.

Mr. JAVITS. Third, to turn over this responsibility at the earliest feasible moment to the Organization of American States with full relinquishment on our part and no strings?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I think that is very important.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I commend the distinguished majority leader and other Senators who have spoken on this subject. Their speeches have been most timely. I am not on the Foreign Relations Committee, but I happen to live in a State that is closer than any other State to the trouble in the Dominican Republic and to Latin America generally. We are very close to our Latin American neighbors and there are many ties between our State of Florida and Latin America.

I wish to accentuate two points. First, the distinguished majority leader spoke of the need of action by the Organization of American States. I believe that the existing crisis is the acid test of the usefulness of the Organization of American States. If other member nations can find it in their hearts and consciences to respond fully and to furnish

armed troops to set up an inter-American command to make it clear that they will stand with our country in repelling either invasion or this newfangled sort of intervention, which is by infiltration, and then by guerrilla warfare, I think it will not only be a fine thing in ending this particular troublesome situation, but also it will be a very fine and promising development for the future. It will give stature to the Organization of American States which it has never had and which is very badly needed. It will probably result in Canada asking for membership. Senators will remember that Canada has been willing to send her troops with peace-keeping forces in various parts of the world when she has been called upon by other bodies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. By the United Nations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. My own feeling is that the Organization of American States is presented with an acid test. I was glad to hear that Secretary General Mora, for whom I have a great deal of respect, responded immediately and went down there.

I was glad to see that, in spite of a little reluctance, a committee of five members was organized without too great delay representing five of the Latin American countries, to go to Santo Domingo and be there on the ground as a stabilizing factor. I hope that the result of that organization's presence will be the activation of the Organization of American States in a way that has not existed heretofore, but that is very badly needed.

Before I end that point, I wish to say that considering the room for suspicion that our good friend, the Republic of Mexico, has in looking at us, remembering all the things that have happened in the past, I thought the remarks of the distinguished Foreign Minister, Mr. Flores, who was Ambassador to the United States not so long ago, were decidedly temperate and that we should highly appreciate them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would agree with what the distinguished senior Senator from Florida has just said. The remarks made by the Foreign Minister of Mexico, Antonio Carrillo Flores, certainly were, in my opinion, temperate and understanding in relation to what has happened to his country and to other countries rimming the Caribbean over past decades.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

My second point is this: We would be very wise if we brought Puerto Rico and the Puerto Rican people into this matter as speedily and as actively as possible. If there is to be participation in a permanent inter-American force, it would be my suggestion, made out of an abundance of ignorance as to many of the details, that the Puerto Rico National Guard be used. I have seen units of the Puerto Rico National Guard. They are well trained. I believe they would acquit themselves well. They are neighbors of the Dominican Republic. They speak

May 4, 1965

the same language. Not only would they acquit themselves well; they would receive from the beginning a great amount of good will from the people who must be somewhat suspicious—the people of the Dominican Republic.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without giving the matter careful thought, the proposal to have Puerto Rico join the 19 American States to comprise an Inter-American Peace Force seems to have substantial foundation. They are Spanish-speaking people who would fit in very well with the nations of the hemisphere and could well help to represent the United States in such an organization.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana. I offer the suggestion merely for consideration by those who will have a chance to consider the intimate facts better than I can here.

Second, former Governor Muñoz Marin is a person who has established himself as a real statesman, who has shown his independence in many ways concerning our way of thinking in this country, and yet has insisted upon his country becoming a permanent part of the United States, having commonwealth status. If a consultative body or an advisory group, or something of that sort, is to be established in the Dominican Republic, I suggest that we not overlook the fact that we have in Puerto Rico, headed by former Governor Muñoz Marin, several well trained statesmen who can represent this country with ability and who, at the same time, will be recognized as having the ability to talk the same language. I am speaking not only in terms of the words they use; but they would have the same Latin American viewpoint. Many of them are Spanish-Americans. Some, of course, in Santo Domingo are French-Americans. Some, from Brazil—and I am glad to observe that Brazil has already responded helpfully—are Portuguese-Americans. But they would be recognized as a part of the great Latin-American group who number more in their total population than we have in the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Again, the Senator from Florida has made a noteworthy contribution. I fully approve of the idea that such contacts should be established—and I feel certain they would be—with such men as former governor, now Senator Muñoz-Marín; with Romulo Betancourt, former President of Venezuela; and with Jose Figueres, former President of Costa Rica; and I would hope also with a man who served with distinction in the Department of State as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Dr. Arturo Morales-Carrion. Dr. Morales-Carrion is one of the outstanding scholars of hemispheric affairs with a distinguished record and reputation not only in Puerto Rico and the United States, but throughout the Americas. All of these men could serve as a bridge

in our understanding of the rest of the hemisphere. All of them are men of great distinction, who have made contributions to the betterment of their countries and the hemisphere as a whole.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

I close by saying again that I believe this is a magnificent opportunity, as well as an acid test, for the Organization of American States. I hope that that Organization will rise to the opportunity and fulfill its high potentialities. It can become a most useful, strongly effective, and highly respected body, which it has not always been in the past. I want it to become such a body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; I agree with the distinguished Senator from Florida. We want mutual respect with them; we want a mutual assumption of responsibility; we want them to take their proper role in the affairs of the hemisphere as a whole.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am in thorough accord with what my good friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has just said about the OAS. Now is the time for it to exhibit its capabilities as a peacemaker. It must not fail us. It should be in the forefront in an effort to bring about peace in Santo Domingo. I do not intend at this time to restate my views in respect to both Cuba and the Dominican Republic. I have said on many occasions that Castro should never have been recognized by us and that I thought it was tragic for the late General Trujillo to have been ousted from the Dominican Republic by way of assassination. But all of that now is water under the bridge.

I heard the President this morning; I heard him last night over the radio. From what he said, that area of the world is in grave danger at the moment. He stated that a large number of Americans and foreigners are there and must be protected. As the distinguished Senator from Florida has said, the acid test for the continued existence, and support by us, of the OAS, is near at hand. Unless the member nations are able to work together and help to ward off communism in the Southern Hemisphere, its usefulness will be questionable. We should not be compelled to carry the burden alone.

So far as I am concerned, although I have criticized what was done in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic, the fact is, our forces are now engaged in both areas, and the time has not arrived for us to retreat. Based on the knowledge at hand I believe Congress ought to respond to the request of the President for additional funds. So far as I am concerned, that is the course I shall pursue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I congratulate the Senator from Montana on his comments and

analysis of the situation. I agree with him completely and stress particularly the desirability of following through on the positive suggestions he has made for seeking equal numbers of troops from many different nations, and for the substitution, as quickly as possible, of the OAS in handling the problem.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] brought out the fact that there is a certain lack of flexibility in the situation in which we are and that, therefore, it is doubly important to persuade the OAS to assume responsibility.

There is another point, to underline the words of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and that is that the Dominican Republic is on our very doorstep. While it may not be in accordance with international law, it is generally accepted among the nations of the world that we have a particular relationship to our neighboring nations in this hemisphere. It was in recognition of this fact that the Monroe Doctrine was enunciated and accepted by the rest of the world. In addition, little nations, close to great nations are generally part of their sphere of influence. On these bases, we have taken drastic action in the past in this hemisphere. As the Senator from Vermont pointed out, it is not the same as the situation that exists in southeast Asia and the two situations are different.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the Voting Rights Act of 1965, S. 1564.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall address myself primarily to S. 1564, which is the original bill before the Senate, with reference to the so-called voting rights question, and refer to various parts or all of the pending matters of the original bill, and then the proposed substitute, as well as the Ervin amendment.

First I wish to address myself quite briefly to the proposition of the rights of the States, and the governing bodies of the States, to impose such reasonable tests as they may see fit as qualifications of the right to vote. This has al-

May 4, 1965

the "Civil War Naval Chronology" is certainly one of the notable permanent contributions to come out of the Civil War Centennial.

"One should not study the Civil War, or any war, from a single standpoint of land campaigns or sea operations," writes Adm. E. M. Eller, Director of Naval History, in a perceptive foreword to part V. "Together land and sea make up the combined military power of a nation. Either can be a great blessing by itself in this jungle world where ruthless men ever resort to brute power. Yet together in combined operations their strengths multiply rather than merely add. For example, while navies can achieve many successes by themselves, a mighty virtue indeed is the added capability warships give of concentrating a nation's total power at the point of decision."

"Further advantages exist in the inherent capabilities that exist afloat of mobility, flexibility, speed of concentration and attack."

"The influences of the sea pervaded the Civil War and inevitably shaped the outcome like a flood tide that reaches all shores. This was true dramatically in a few large battles, as in Farragut's decisive passage of the forts of the Mississippi that with the fall of New Orleans brought the certain defeat of the South. It was similarly true in hundreds of other events * * * Union strength afloat contributed in many ways to the North's victory and to disaster for the South."

The "Civil War Naval Chronology" will enable any student of the Civil War to follow stage by stage, month by month, year by year for the 4 years of bitter warfare, the naval operations of both the Union and Confederate Navies.

When the project of a Civil War naval chronology was first planned, a maximum of 250 pages—about 50 pages a year for 5 years—was envisaged. But, as will be seen by the following, the project quickly developed to almost three times the original projected length:

Part I, covering the naval events of 1861, was only 41 pages long, and cost only 25 cents at the Government Printing Office.

Part II, listing sea operations of 1862, had 117 pages and cost 60 cents.

Part III, the largest of all, required 169 pages to record the war on the water in 1863. This part of "Civil War Naval Chronology" cost \$1.

Part IV, costing 75 cents, told the naval doings of 1864 in 151 pages.

Part V, just issued at 75 cents, has 149 pages to record the naval activities of 1865.

Individual copies, or the complete set of five parts, may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402. The cost for all five parts is \$3.35. The complete work thus becomes one of the biggest bargains in Civil War literature. An index to the five-part chronology is scheduled to be published at a later date.

The chronology "team," under the direction of Admiral Eller, consisted of Dr. William J. Morgan, head of the research section, and Lt. Richard M. Basco, USNR. They were assisted from time to time by others on temporary assignments when the workload became too heavy.

In the closing words to his prefatory comments to part V, Admiral Eller neatly sums up the outcome of the war and what might have happened:

"The North's superiority afloat indeed was so overwhelming and so well exploited that perhaps nothing the South could have done could have overcome it and prevented defeat."

"On the other hand, had the South foreseen the inevitable fatal results of the North's sea superiority and taken dynamic action at the outset * * * some of the early irreversible disasters like New Orleans might have been averted or long delayed. Consequently the war might have ended in a stalemate and

a divided nation. That it did not seems surely an act of providence in the stirring history of the great American dream of liberty that today, reaching across all seas to all men by the power of ships, seems even more than ever "the last best hope of earth."

sured the OAS that the United States does not back any man or faction in the Dominican crisis and that the United States will act in conformity with OAS decisions.

The OAS should take advantage of the U.S. offer to be the OAS instrument in working for peace and the restoration of a stable non-Communist government in the Dominican Republic. By doing so the OAS would serve notice (as President Johnson has done) that Communist attempts to subvert governments in the Western Hemisphere will be met with instant and unified resistance.

Two-Front War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President is receiving overwhelming support from the public for the strong position he has taken in Vietnam and now in the Dominican Republic.

Despite shrill outbursts from members of the President's party it is evident that there is great grassroot support for a firm foreign policy.

An editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times is typical of the kind of support the President is receiving:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, May 4, 1965]

TWO-FRONT WAR

The role of the United States in the Dominican crisis has expanded and changed in the past week. It began as protection for American citizens. It has changed to the more difficult task of halting a Communist attempt to take over the Government of the Dominican Republic.

The record of evacuations should put down the criticism voiced by some members of the Organization of American States. The United States has taken more than 3,000 persons of 30 nations out of the danger zone. More than 5,000, including 1,500 Americans, remain to be evacuated. President Johnson prevented, and is preventing, what might have been a massacre of innocent persons.

Some of the criticism of the U.S. action in moving a powerful military force into the Dominican Republic is founded, without doubt, in the old fears of imperialist American intervention in Latin American affairs.

Those fears belong to the past. They are not valid today. But still they remain. They should have been eased by President Johnson's speech on Sunday evening. Mr. Johnson pointed out that the leaders of the Dominican revolt had been displaced by Communists, many of them trained in Cuba. If those Latin American nations which criticize the United States for its attempt to contain Communist subversion in one of their sister nations have an alternative to such subversion they should speak up. Certainly Venezuela, which has suffered greatly at the hands of Cuban attempts at subversion, should not be critical. Venezuela should have been one of the first to defend the U.S. move to halt the Communists in the Dominican Republic.

President Johnson acted correctly in the newest crisis in the Caribbean. If the United States must fight the Communist attempts to overthrow the Government of South Vietnam it must fight the Communist attempt to take over the Government of the Dominican Republic. The Communist objective is the same in both areas.

The United States has asked that other Latin American nations make their armed forces available to keep the peace in the Dominican Republic. This is a flat counter to the charges of "aggression" made by the Communists. President Johnson has as-

Polish Constitution Day: A Tribute

SPEECH

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Today, Mr. Speaker, we are commemorating the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. This is a great day for the Polish people, and it is a day that they commemorate with a feeling of pride and a sense of honor. This feeling comes not from the fact that this Constitution had had any practical effect upon the political system of Poland, because the Russians had invaded Poland, crushed the Polish opposition, and destroyed the Constitution before it could really have become deeply engrained in the Polish system of government. Rather this feeling comes from the fact that this Constitution represents the totality of Polish aspirations for freedom and democracy. The Constitution was not long lasting. This is true. But what lived on in the Polish tradition were the ideals of this Constitution. And so even today this Constitution is a source of inspiration for all Poles.

To speak of the Polish historical experience is to speak of a series of great tragedies that have befallen this much-respected and much-honored people. At the beginning of World War II, Poland was invaded and partitioned by the Nazis and the Soviets. In the spring of 1940, the Soviets killed off the flower of Polish leadership when it murdered thousands of Poland's soldiers at Katyn. In the closing days of World War II, Poland found her territory occupied again by the hated Soviet Russians. And in those days the Russians destroyed what hopes of freedom were possible by grossly violating the Yalta agreement that had called for free and unfettered elections. In the process of imposing their tyrannical system, the Soviets also imprisoned the leaders of Poland's underground government.

We call to mind today these tragedies, Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the anniversary of the May 3 Constitution. To Poles everywhere and to the members of the Polish-American Congress, a body that has kept alive American concern for Poland, I extend my congratulations and join with all of my colleagues in this Chamber to salute Polish people everywhere in their continuing struggle to throw off the yoke of tyranny.

May 4, 1965

Representative Race Urges Labor Support
of President on VietnamEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OFHON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
• WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last weekend my distinguished colleague from the State of Wisconsin, the Honorable JOHN A. RACE, spoke to a convention of the Wisconsin State Council of Machinists at Port Washington, Wis.

In his remarks he urged strong support by the members of organized labor for the policies of the Johnson administration in Vietnam. He pointed out that labor's record of opposition to aggression and appeasement of aggressors is a long and honorable one.

Representative RACE made an eloquent and moving plea to his audience to recognize the Communist aggression in Vietnam as a calculated threat to their personal freedoms and the liberties of their children.

Because of the pertinency of this address to the events of the recent days, I am pleased to insert it into the RECORD at this point and urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

AN ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN A. RACE,
TO THE WISCONSIN STATE COUNCIL OF
MACHINISTS, PORT WASHINGTON, WIS., APRIL
30, 1965

I have been a delegate to these State council sessions for many years as a representative of my home lodge 1402 of Fond du Lac. Participation in these conferences, I am sure, sharpened my interest and broadened my horizons in the human affairs of my brothers—not only members of this great machinists union—but my countrymen, and brothers of the world.

I urge you to take advantage of these conferences. Learn from the experts here all you can about our union, the labor movement, and the best methods of achieving our goals.

Most of your work at this conference will be related to collective bargaining—your lodge's relationship to management—and legislation at the State and national levels that support our position.

I think I know what you expect me to talk about tonight. I think you anticipate, and you have every right to anticipate, that I will talk to you about labor legislation and the condition of the American working man.

Legislation like repeal of 14-B of the Taft-Hartley Act, revisions in unemployment compensation, increase and extension of the minimum wage law.

These issues are vital to you—and rightly so.

Other legislation even more important to you is the aid-to-education bill and the social security amendments contained in the so-called medicare bill.

I am sure I surprise none of you when I report that I voted in favor of the education bill which the President signed into law April 11. I also voted in favor of the social security, or medicare bill, which passed the House 313 to 115.

But I want to talk to you tonight about something even more important than labor legislation, than the education bill, than the social security amendments. You know where I stand on these issues anyway.

I am going to talk about the policies of this Government in the most serious crisis before the world today. This is more important to labor than labor law, because the working man, like the farmer, or the banker, or the bureaucrat, or the used car salesman is first an American. And the immediate interests of his country, and the cause for which it stands, come foremost in his mind and his heart.

I plan to talk to you tonight about the overriding issue of our time—and that is, which concept is going to prevail for our children and our grandchildren and future generations?

Revolutionary communism which denies the freedom of the individual?

Or our own free democratic society where the individual—and yes, the majority of individuals—is going to be master of his own destiny?

We, as members of the International Association of Machinists, have a proud history of being in the forefront battlelines opposed to communism.

We do not have to take a backseat to the Johnny-Come-Lately-Birchers—the Minutemen—or anyone else in love and loyalty to our country.

As pointed out in the recent editorial of our newspaper, the Machinist, * * * "Labor's record of opposition to appeasement of aggressors is long and honorable. Organized labor fought Mussolini, Hitler, Stalin, Mao Tse-tung, and Khrushchev. We now oppose Communist aggression against South Vietnam."

As a member of organized labor, as a Member of Congress, as an American, I support the policies of President Johnson on Vietnam.

I don't support them merely because he is President and I am a Democratic Member of Congress, though I think there is much to be said for the principle that all Americans ought to support the President in foreign policy matters unless he is clearly wrong.

I do not support him on the grounds that we don't know enough to have an opinion on the subject, because I feel the essential facts are available to the American people.

Moreover, I do not support the President because I feel superior to those who oppose him.

We in organized labor agree with President Johnson that the central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied.

"We fight," as the President said, "because we must fight if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure."

I have been studying our position and policy in Vietnam.

And I have been thinking about it—as, I am sure, you have.

Maybe some of you are confused over the rightness or wrongness of our actions in Vietnam. Maybe some of you—God forbid—are indifferent. Maybe some of you don't think we should be there. Maybe some of you have not thought about Vietnam in terms of a threat to your own peace and freedom in this country.

To you I address my remarks tonight. And I do so with the greatest sense of urgency.

A review of our newspapers reveals a deep division among our editorial writers and columnists. Some say we should not even be in Vietnam, while others urge an escalation of the war there.

A deep division of opinion also can be noted among our educators, religious leaders, and yes, even among Members of Congress.

And over Holy Week and Easter, thousands and thousands of young people from all over this country congregated in Washington to demonstrate against our Vietnam policy.

Let me try to put Vietnam in clearer perspective.

Let me try to help you understand a little more clearly that Vietnam is important to you—and why.

First of all, let me try to bring Vietnam a little closer to home.

I wonder how many of you could tell me the approximate population of Vietnam. You have been reading about Vietnam in your newspapers for years.

Why don't all of you, right now, make a mental guess of Vietnam's population.

Latest, reliable census figures for Vietnam place the population at 31,517,000 persons.

Roughly, that is the combined population of Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana.

The Vietnamese population is divided with about 16 million persons in North Vietnam, and 15 million in South Vietnam.

These 31 million persons live in a country, smaller in size than the combined land area of Wisconsin and Minnesota.

I mention these facts only to dispel a common belief that Vietnam is some little spot of jungle in southeast Asia, populated by a few thousand—or even a couple million—people living in huts.

North Vietnam shares its border with Communist China.

South Vietnam is like a finger stretching into the great, free area of southeast Asia with some 200 million persons not under Communist domination.

Communist success in South Vietnam would gravely threaten the freedom and independence of the rest of southeast Asia—including Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Burma, Malaysia, Indonesia, India, and the Philippines.

There are more people living in those independent nations than in the entire United States.

We are in Vietnam for a very simple reason.

In 1954 and in 1962 the countries involved sought to negotiate the problems of that harassed and unhappy part of the globe. Negotiations were held and solemn agreements were entered into. Those agreements have been systematically and continually violated by the Communist regime in North Vietnam virtually since the day they were signed.

The North Vietnamese have been engaged in aggression against the territory and people of South Vietnam for several years. The evidence of this is overwhelming, and it has been made available for the American people to judge.

The heart of the problem in Vietnam is the infiltration of trained military personnel and war material from North Vietnam into South Vietnam.

The infiltration over the years has added tens of thousands of trained troops and saboteurs which are the hard core of the so-called Vietcong.

It is true that many people in South Vietnam are terrorized into cooperation, or at least passiveness. But there is no case at all to back up the assertion that this is essentially a civil war, or that there is mass support for the Vietcong in South Vietnam except where and when the Vietcong terror activities force the local people to cooperate.

In this connection, it is significant that the major type of Vietcong activity has been—not armed attacks against the troops of the South Vietnamese Government—but terror attacks against South Vietnamese civilians.

In December, 1964, for example, there were 96 Vietcong armed attacks as compared to 1,719 acts of terrorism and 318 acts of sabotage.

If the Vietcong effort is, as they claim it is—"a Vietnamese people's struggle against imperialism"—murders and kidnaps of